



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,673	11/21/2003	Pierre Coldefy	245519US41X DIV	9065
22850	7590	05/22/2006		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER RAHMJOO, MANUCHER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2628	

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/717,673

Applicant(s)

COLDEFY ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Rahmjoo

Art Unit

2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-14, 16, 17 and 19-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-14, 16, 17 and 19-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 10- 14, 16,17 and 19- 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Briffe et al, US Patent 6,112,141, hereinafter, Briffe in view of Kishi et al (US Patent 4366475), hereinafter, Kishi.

As per claim 10 and to the broadest reasonable interpretation by examiner, Briffe teaches providing data related to an airport (airport map) see for example column 17 line 10; Briffe inherently teaches reconfiguring a zoom characteristic (see for example column 19 lines 31- 32 for the zoom control that can specify a desired discrete map scale for display on the display device) from an initial maximum zoom value to a new final maximum value such that different types of airports (see for example column 20 lines 5- 9 for the destination or closest airport) may be displayed with a single display device and displaying different views of the airport (see for example column 19 lines 13- 40 for the different adjustment of zoom to display the map and aeronautical information databases at the desired scale) using the reconfigured zoom characteristics; and Selecting a portion of the airport to be displayed see for example

MFD (as functions of the MFD are founded on the basic idea of displaying desired portions of at least two data bases stored in MAU 65d (FIG. 2), highlighting or "capturing" specific features of the displayed data with the cursor, and "selecting" the captured features to permit modification of the displayed feature or storing into a flight plan) and SID (when the SID is chosen, the pilot can directly call up the corresponding navigational chart on MFD 18,20 by clicking on the "SID map" key in main menu wherein the same information is available for the airport map) as described in columns 11 lines 20- 40 and column 36 lines 5- 15 respectively and claim 5 and figures 10- 14.

However, Briffe does not teach setting a zoom value of first, second and third actuators to corresponding predefined zoom degrees by entering first, second and third values through a numerical keypad and displaying accordingly.

Kishi teach setting a zoom value of first, second and third actuators (fig. 2 keys k0- k9) to corresponding predefined zoom degrees by entering first, second and third values through a numerical keypad and displaying accordingly see for example fig. 2 and column 3 lines 15- 45.

It would have been made obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Kishi into Briffe to have multiple actuator with predefined zoom degrees on numerical keypad to provide an image display system which permits any desired region of the image on an image surface to be appointed and displayed at an enlarged (or reduced scale) and therefore permit the operator to easily understand the relationship between the keys for appointing the regions of the image see for example column 1 lines 55- 67 through column 2 lines 1- 8.

As per claim 11 Briffe teaches displaying the airport in a window according to the first predefined zoom degree corresponding to general navigation including a full display of the airport see for example figure 13; displaying the airport in the window according to the second predefined zoom degree corresponding to proximity navigation including a plurality of details of the airport see for example column 6 lines 53- 63 for the navigation sensors when landing and column 8 line 8 for the display of navigation data; and displaying the airport in the window according to the third predefined zoom degree corresponding to airport details required for precision taxiing see for example column 17 lines 29- 35.

As per claims 12 and 21- 22 Briffe teaches automatically reconfiguring the display such that the predetermined portion of the airport that includes the display is displayed in a center of a window (rose centered on the aircraft in the display) see for example column 9 lines 48- 52 and also figures 3 and 10- 13.

As per claim 13 Briffe teaches displaying the predetermined portions of the airport in a cyclic manner based the recognized zoom characteristics see for example column 19 lines 43- 44 through continuous variable scale adjustment and displaying.

As per claims 14 and in light of the rejection of claim 13, and as to the broadest reasonable interpretation by examiner, Briffe teaches automatically displaying the entire airport on the window upon selection of the automatically displaying step and to redisplay a portion of the airport being displayed prior to selection of the automatically displaying step upon another selection of the automatically displaying step see for example column 17 lines 30- 37.

As per claims 16 and 23- 24, and as to the broadest reasonable interpretation by examiner, Briffe teaches displacing a view of the airport being displayed on the window in horizontal and vertical directions so as to display other portions of the airport see for example column 11 lines 12- 19.

As per claim 17 Briffe teaches displaying two different views of the airport corresponding to different reconfigured zoom characteristic (inherently taught through zoom function) in a continuous manner such that a change from the first reconfigured zoom characteristic to the second reconfigured zoom characteristic appears continuous to an operator viewing the display see for example column 19 lines 40- 45 and claim 14.

As per claims 19- 20 Briffe inherently teaches the reconfiguring to both a size and a complexity of the airport see for example column 19 lines 31- 32 for the zoom control that can specify a desired discrete map scale for display on the display device) from an initial maximum zoom value to a new final maximum value such that different types of airports (see for example column 20 lines 5- 9 for the destination or closest airport) may be displayed with a single display device and displaying different views of the airport (see for example column 19 lines 13- 40 for the different adjustment of zoom to display the map and aeronautical information databases at the desired scale) using the reconfigured zoom characteristics.

As per claim 25 Briffe teaches the display device is integrated into a portable computer see for example fig. 2.

As per claim 26 Briffe teaches a rose mode see for example column 9 lines 30- 40.

As per claim 27 Briffe teaches an arc mode see for example column 9 lines 42-52.

As per claim 28 Briffe teaches a plan mode see for example column 16 lines 45-60.

As per claim 29 briffe teaches centering a view of the airport on a different one of plural predetermined portions of the airport each time a selection mechanism is activated see for example figure 1 and column 5 lines 35- 40 for the two track balls each including four special push buttons (corresponding to selection mechanism) which upon "click" 48 "centered" map 50.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10- 14,16,17,19-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.



### **Inquiry**


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mike Rahmjoo whose telephone number is 571-272-7789. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM- 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on 571-272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mike Rahmjoo

February 17, 2006



**Kee M. Tung**  
**Primary Examiner**